(1)

SINGLE BENCH

03

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, AT BILASPUR

CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1564 /2005

PETITIONER : Narendra Singh Bais, s/o. Shri Birendra Singh Bais, aged about 46 years, R/o. Village – Dasrangpur, Tah. Pandariya, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.).

Versus

RESPONDENTS

1) State of Chhattisgarh,
Through Secretary,
School Education Department,
Mantralaya, D.K.S.Bhawan,
G.E.Road, Raipur (C.G.).

2) Director of Public Instructions,
Govt. of Chhattisgarh,
Directorate of Public Instructions,
(DPI Office) Pension Bada,
Raipur (C.G.)

3) Deputy Director of Public Instruction,
Govt. of Chhattisgarh,
Education Department,
Education District Bilaspur, (C.G.).

P.R. No. ... Presented by ... dated ... 08. Apr. 05

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.1564/ **सन्** **2005**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	26.4.2005 Mr. Alok Nigam, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Bhaskar Pyasi, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents. Heard both the counsel. The case of the petitioner is that the Education Department of erstwhile State of M.P. conducted a test for the appointment of Assistant Teachers in the Government Primary Schools. In that test the petitioner was selected and vide order dated 14-08-1981 he was appointed on ad-hoc basis on daily wages of Rs.6.50 per day. However, the services of the petitioner were discontinued on 15-12-1981 and the vacancy which arose on account of discontinuation of the petitioner's services was filled by the State of M.P. Thereafter, the petitioner is regularly making representations for considering his case for appointment on the post of teacher. Further case of the petitioner is that in the year 1997 the erstwhile State of M.P. took a decision to appoint ad-hoc teachers in place of Shiksha Karmi but same is not being implemented by the State of Chhattisgarh. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to respondent No.2 raising all his grievances and respondent No.2 be directed to decide his representation, to which learned Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents has no objection.	

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

19

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक W.P.1564/ **सन्** **2005**

..... **विरुद्ध** .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित —2—	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a representation within a period of ten days from today to respondent No.2 raising all his grievances and in turn respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation of the petitioner within three months from the date of receipt of the representation after considering all the grievances raised by the petitioner, in accordance with law. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, I.A.Nos.3035/2005 & 3036/2005 also stand disposed of. Certified copy as per rules. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Soma

(पीछे देखिये)

26/4/05